



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Florence P. Haseltine Art Unit : 3625
Serial No. : 09/727,593 Examiner : Robert E. Rhode, Jr.
Filed : December 4, 2000
Title : PROVIDING ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO CONSUMER-CUSTOMIZED
NONVERBAL INFORMATION REGARDING PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED OCTOBER 20, 2004,
NOVEMBER 10, 2004, & NOVEMBER 19, 2004

Applicant submits the following remarks to summarize the telephone discussions conducted between Applicant's representative, Kevin Greene, and Examiner Rhode and Examiner Coggins.

Claims 1, 21, and 41 were initially rejected as anticipated by Harada and claims 2, 22, and 42 were rejected as obvious over Harada in view of Watanabe. In the response filed August 30, 2004, Applicant incorporated the features of claims 2, 22, and 42 into independent claims 1, 21, and 41, respectively.

Initially, as indicated in the advisory action dated October 7, 2004, the August 30th amendment was not entered. Applicant's representative, Kevin Greene, contacted Examiner Rhode on October 20, 2004 to discuss the entry of the amendment. Applicant's representative indicated that he believed the amendment should have been entered because it reduced issues for appeal by simply incorporating dependent claims into the independent claims. The Examiner indicated that he would review the case and re-consider whether to enter the amendment. The Examiner issued a second advisory action, dated October 28, 2004, that still denied entry of the amendment. On approximately November 10, 2004, Applicant's representative contacted Examiner Coggins (the Supervisory Patent Examiner who signed the advisory action) to again discuss the entry of the amendment. After a discussion with Examiner Coggins, it was agreed that the amendment would be entered. The advisory action dated November 17, 2004, entering the amendment, was then issued.

However, this advisory action did not contain an explanation of how the amended claims would be rejected. Applicant's representative, Kevin Greene, contacted Examiner Rhode on November 19, 2004 to discuss how the claims would be rejected in light of the entered amendment. Examiner Rhode indicated that claims 1, 21, and 22 would be rejected for the same reason as claims 2, 22, and 42, respectively, and that the other claims dependent on claims 1, 21, and 41 would be rejected as they were in the office action dated April 29, 2004. This results in claims 1, 21, and 41, and those claims depending from them, being rejected as obvious over Harada in view of Watanabe.

No fees are believed to be due. However, in the event there are fees due, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/30/04



Kevin E. Greene
Reg. No. 46,031

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331